



***** INITIAL STUDY *****

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING**

GENERAL INFORMATION

C.S. II Date: September 22, 2008 Staff Member: Jeffrey A. Juarez

Thomas Guide: Pages 589, 590, 630 USGS Quad: Topanga, Malibu Beach

Location: The Topanga area Community Standards Districts are located in the Santa Monica Mountains, along the Coastal Zone Boundary, west of the City of Los Angeles, south of the City of Woodland Hills, and north of the City of Malibu.

Description of Project: Amendments to the Topanga Canyon and Santa Monica North Area Community Standards Districts (CSDs) authorizing the Director of Regional Planning to consider yard modifications for construction of fences and walls exceeding the maximum allowable height within required yard setbacks, and establishing development standards for fences and walls. The current CSDs authorize consideration of yard modifications only through the variance procedure contained in Part 2 of Chapter 22.56 of the Planning and Zoning Code. The proposed amendments will limit fences and walls within required yard setbacks to a maximum height of six feet.

Gross Acres: 4,709

Environmental Setting: The area potentially affected by the amendment is situated within the eastern unincorporated Santa Monica Mountains. The area is characterized by the presence of urban-density single-family residences, neighborhood commercial areas along Topanga Canyon Boulevard, and narrow winding mountain roads. The terrain includes rolling and steep hills, some with Significant Ridgelines, streams, canyons, and ponds. The area's flora consists of native vegetation, such as oak trees, chaparral, scrub, and ornamental landscaping, and its diverse fauna includes Steelhead Trout, Southwestern Pond Turtles, red-Legged frogs, coyotes, bobcats, and red-tailed hawks.

Zoning: A-1, A-2, R-1, R-R, O-S, C-3, M-1

General Plan: R – Rural Communities, O – Open Space, SEA – Significant Ecological Area

Community/Area wide Plan: Parks, Residential I, Institution and Public Facilities, Rural Land I, Rural Land II, Rural Land III, Mountain Land, Rural Commercial

Major projects in area:

<u>PROJECT NUMBER</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION & STATUS</u>
<i>Not Applicable</i>	

NOTE: For EIRs, above projects are not sufficient for cumulative analysis.

REVIEWING AGENCIES

<u>Responsible Agencies</u>	<u>Special Reviewing Agencies</u>	<u>Regional Significance</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> None	<input type="checkbox"/> None
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional Water Quality Control Board	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy	<input type="checkbox"/> SCAG Criteria
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Los Angeles Region	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Parks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/> Lahontan Region	<input type="checkbox"/> National Forest	<input type="checkbox"/> Water Resources
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coastal Commission	<input type="checkbox"/> Edwards Air Force Base	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Santa Monica Mtns. Area
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Army Corps of Engineers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mtns. Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fish & Wildlife Service	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Caltrans	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cal State Fullerton	<u>County Reviewing Agencies</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Subdivision Committee
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DPW: Land Development
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Traffic and Lighting
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Geotechnical and Materials Engineering
<u>Trustee Agencies</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Waterworks and Sewer Maintenance
		Drainage and Grading
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Fish and Game	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Parks and Recreation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Parks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fire Department
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sheriff
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Library
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Health
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sanitation Districts

<u>IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX</u>		ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details)			
			Less than Significant Impact/No Impact		
			Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation		
				Potentially Significant Impact	
CATEGORY	FACTOR	Pg			Potential Concern
HAZARDS	1. Geotechnical	5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	2. Flood	6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	3. Fire	7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	4. Noise	8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
RESOURCES	1. Water Quality	9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	2. Air Quality	10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	3. Biota	11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	4. Cultural Resources	12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	5. Mineral Resources	13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	6. Agriculture Resources	14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	7. Visual Qualities	15	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SERVICES	1. Traffic/Access	16	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	2. Sewage Disposal	17	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	3. Education	18	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	4. Fire/Sheriff	19	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	5. Utilities	20	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OTHER	1. General	21	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	2. Environmental Safety	22	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	3. Land Use	23	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	4. Pop/Hous./Emp./Rec.	24	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	5. Mandatory Findings	25	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DEVELOPMENT MONITORING SYSTEM (DMS)

As required by the Los Angeles County General Plan, DMS* shall be employed in the Initial Study phase of the environmental review procedure as prescribed by state law.

- Development Policy Map Designation: 4 – Urban Expansion; 6 – Rural Commercial; 7 – Non-Urban Hillside; 9 – Non-Urban Open Space; 10 – Significant Ecological Area
- ☒ Yes ☐ No Is the project located in the Antelope Valley, East San Gabriel Valley, Malibu/Santa Monica Mountains or Santa Clarita Valley planning area?
- ☐ Yes ☒ No Is the project at urban density and located within, or proposes a plan amendment to, an urban expansion designation?

If both of the above questions are answered "yes", the project is subject to a County DMS analysis.

☐ Check if DMS printout generated (attached)

Date of printout: _____

☐ Check if DMS overview worksheet completed (attached)

*EIRs and/or staff reports shall utilize the most current DMS information available.

Environmental Finding:

FINAL DETERMINATION: On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning finds that this project qualifies for the following environmental document:

☒ NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was determined that this project will not exceed the established threshold criteria for any environmental/service factor and, as a result, will not have a significant effect on the physical environment.

☐ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, in as much as the changes required for the project will reduce impacts to insignificant levels (see attached discussion and/or conditions).

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was originally determined that the proposed project may exceed established threshold criteria. The applicant has agreed to modification of the project so that it can now be determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the physical environment. The modification to mitigate this impact(s) is identified on the Project Changes/Conditions Form included as part of this Initial Study.

☐ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT*, inasmuch as there is substantial evidence that the project may have a significant impact due to factors listed above as “significant”.

☐ At least one factor has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets (see attached Form DRP/IA 101). The Addendum EIR is required to analyze only the factors changed or not previously addressed.

Reviewed by: Jeffrey A. Juarez Date: September 17, 2008

Approved by: _____ Date: _____

☒ This proposed project is exempt from Fish and Game CEQA filing fees. There is no substantial evidence that the proposed project will have potential for an adverse effect on wildlife or the habitat upon which the wildlife depends. (Fish & Game Code 753.5).

☐ Determination appealed – see attached sheet.

*NOTE: Findings for Environmental Impact Reports will be prepared as a separate document following the public hearing on the project.

HAZARDS - 1. Geotechnical

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone? <hr/> <i>Los Angeles County Safety Element: Fault Rupture Hazards and Historic Seismicity Map</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)? <hr/> <i>The project area contains some historic landslides (State of California Seismic Hazard Zones Map – Topanga, Malibu Beach Quads), but the project does not propose any new development in major landslide areas.</i>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability? <hr/> <i>The project area may have areas of high slope instability, but the project does not propose any new development in these areas.</i>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction? <hr/> <i>The project area contains historic or potential occurrence of liquefaction (State of California Seismic Hazard Zones Map – Topanga, Malibu Beach Quads), but the project does not propose any new development in these areas.</i>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard? <hr/> <i>The project proposes a change in procedure and modifications to development standards, and does not propose any use that could be considered sensitive and located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard.</i>
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of over 25%? <hr/> <i>The project proposes a change in procedure and modifications to development standards, and does not propose new development. Future development of fences and walls may be subject to the County's grading ordinances.</i>
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? <hr/>
h.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors? <hr/>
<hr/> N/A <hr/>				

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Sections 308B, 309, 310, and 311 and Chapters 29 and 70

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size

☒ Project Design

☐ Approval of Geotechnical Report by DPW

The proposed CSD amendments entail changes to procedure and modifications to development standards, and will not create new development that would impact areas of geotechnical sensitivity. Future development of fences and walls may be subject to the County's grading ordinances.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **geotechnical** factors?

☐ Potentially significant

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than significant/No Impact

HAZARDS - 2. Flood

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Is the major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site? <i>The project area includes Topanga, Old Topanga, Greenleaf, Hondo, Dix, Tuna, Red Rock, Santa Maria and Garapito Creeks (Malibu Beach and Topanga Quads), but no development is proposed that could impact these major drainage courses.</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone? <i>The project area contains a 100-year flood plain (Los Angeles County Safety Element: Flood and Inundation Hazards Map), but no development is proposed in the floodplain area.</i>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions? <i>The project area may have areas of high mudflow conditions, but the project does not propose any new development in areas subject to these conditions.</i>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run-off? <i>The project does not propose new development. Future development of fences and walls may be subject to the County's grading ordinances to address any potential concerns related to erosion and debris deposition from run-off.</i>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area? <i>The project does not propose new development that could alter drainage patterns of the project area.</i>
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors (e.g., dam failure)? <i>N/A</i>

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Section 308A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ordinance No. 12,114 (Floodways)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approval of Drainage Concept by DPW	
<input type="checkbox"/> MITIGATION MEASURES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
<input type="checkbox"/> Lot Size	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Design

The proposed CSD amendments entail changes to procedure and modifications to development standards, and will not create new development. Future development of fences and walls may be subject to the County's grading ordinances to address potential floods impacts and drainage problems.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **flood (hydrological)** factors?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially significant	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than significant with project mitigation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than significant/No impact
--	--	---

HAZARDS - 3. Fire

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is the project site located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4)?</p> <p><i>A majority of the project area is located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Los Angeles County Safety Element – Wildland and Urban Fire Hazards Map), but the project does not propose new development.</i></p>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, width, surface materials, turnarounds or grade?</p> <p><i>The project area is in a high fire hazard area served by inadequate access due to narrow and often steep roads, but the project does not propose new development that could worsen access conditions.</i></p>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area?</p> <p><i>The project area includes Hillside Drive east and west of Topanga Canyon Boulevard and Entrada Road east of Topanga Canyon Boulevard that have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area, but no development is proposed in these areas.</i></p>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards?</p> <p><i>The project area may have inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards, however the project proposes no new development that could increase demands on already-inadequate water and pressure capacity.</i></p>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is the project located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)?</p> <p><i>The project area contains development that utilizes propane tanks, but the project does not propose development that could increase the use of propane tanks or be in close proximity to potentially dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses.</i></p>
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?</p> <p><i>The project does not propose a new use or new development. The proposed amendments do not authorize buildings to be erected in required yard setbacks, therefore no potentially dangerous fire hazard will be created.</i></p>
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Other factors?</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>N/A</i></p>

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Water Ordinance No. 7834 ☒ Fire Ordinance No. 2947 ☒ Fire Regulation No. 8

☒ Fuel Modification / Landscape Plan

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☒ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

The proposed CSD amendments entail changes to procedure and modifications to development standards, and will not create new development. The proposed amendments do not authorize buildings to be erected in required yard setbacks, therefore no potentially dangerous fire hazard will be created.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **fire hazard** factors?

☐ Potentially significant

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 4. Noise

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)? <i>The project area does not contain and is not near any high noise sources.</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity? <i>The project entails changes to procedure and modifications to development standards, and does not propose any new use that could be considered sensitive or is in close proximity to sensitive uses.</i>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project substantially increase ambient noise levels including those associated with special equipment (such as amplified sound systems) or parking areas associated with the project? <i>The project does not propose new development.</i>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project? <i>The project does not propose new development. Future development may be subject to the County's noise ordinance.</i>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors? <i>N/A</i>

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Noise Control (Title 12 – Chapter 8) ☒ Uniform Building Code (Title 26 - Chapter 35)

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☒ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

The proposed CSD amendments entail changes to procedure and modifications to development standards, and will not create new development. Future development of fences and walls may be subject to the County's noise ordinance.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by **noise**?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 1. Water Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells? <i>The project area is known to have water quality problems, but the project does not propose new development or uses that could contribute to known water quality problems, and does not propose the use of individual water wells.</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system? <i>The project does not propose development that could require the use of private sewage disposal systems.</i>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	If the answer is yes, is the project site located in an area having known septic tank limitations due to high groundwater or other geotechnical limitations <i>or</i> is the project proposing on-site systems located in close proximity to a drainage course?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project's associated construction activities significantly impact the quality of groundwater and/or storm water runoff to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving water bodies? <i>The project does not propose new development. Future development may be subject to compliance with NPDES standards.</i>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project's post-development activities potentially degrade the quality of storm water runoff and/or could post-development non-storm water discharges contribute potential pollutants to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving bodies? <i>The project does not propose new development. Future development may be subject to compliance with NPDES standards.</i>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?
N/A				

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Industrial Waste Permit ☒ Health Code – Ordinance No.7583, Chapter 5

☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No.2269 ☒ NPDES Permit Compliance (DPW)

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☒ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

The proposed Topanga Canyon CSD amendment entails changes to procedure and modifications to development standards, and will not create new development. Future development of fences and walls may be subject to compliance with NPDES standards.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, **water quality** problems?

☐ Potentially significant

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 2. Air Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the proposed project exceed the State's criteria for regional significance (generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential users or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for non-residential uses)? <i>The project proposes changes to procedure and modifications to development standards, and does not propose development that could exceed the State's criteria for regional significance.</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use? <i>The project entails changes to procedure and modifications to development standards, and does not propose development or uses considered sensitive and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use.</i>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project increase local emissions to a significant extent due to increased traffic congestion or use of a parking structure or exceed AQMD thresholds of potential significance? <i>The project proposes changes to procedure and modifications to development standards, and does not propose development that could increase traffic congestion or require use of a parking structure, and therefore will not increase local emissions or exceed AQMD thresholds.</i>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources that create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions? <i>The project area does have some sources of obnoxious odors and dust, but the project does not propose new development that could increase obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions in the project area.</i>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? <i>The project proposes changes to procedure and modifications to development standards, and does not propose development that could obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans.</i>
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? <i>The project proposes changes to procedure and modifications to development standards, and does not propose development that could violate air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.</i>
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emission which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? <i>The project proposes changes to procedure and modifications to development standards, and does not propose development that could result cumulatively in a considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant.</i>
h.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors? N/A

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Health and Safety Code – Section 40506

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Project Design ☐ Air Quality Report

The proposed CSD amendments entail changes to procedure and modifications to development standards, and will not create new development that could impact air quality plans, increase traffic congestion or air pollutants, violate air quality standards, or exceed

AQMD emission thresholds.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, **air quality**?

☐ Potentially significant

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 3. Biota

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is the project site located within Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource (ESHA, etc.), or is the site relatively undisturbed and natural?</p> <p><i>Approximately 4 percent of the project area contains ESHA and less than 1 percent contains SEA (Los Angeles County 1986 Malibu Land Use Plan and Los Angeles County SEA Map). The project does not propose development, and future development of fences and walls in these areas may be subject to review by the Environmental Review Board (ERB)</i></p>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas?</p> <p><i>The project does not propose new development that could result in removal of substantial natural habitat areas. Future development of fences and walls may be subject to the County's grading ordinances, and may be subject to review by the ERB.</i></p>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is a drainage course located on the project site that is depicted on USGS quad sheets by a dashed blue line or that may contain a bed, channel, or bank of any perennial, intermittent or ephemeral river, stream, or lake?</p> <p><i>The project area includes Topanga, Old Topanga, Greenleaf, Hondo, Dix, Tuna, Red Rock, Santa Maria, and Garapito Creeks (Malibu Beach and Topanga Quads), but the creek areas comprise a small portion of the project area, and no development is proposed that could impact any drainage courses.</i></p>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Does the project site contain a major riparian or other sensitive habitat (e.g. coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, sycamore riparian, woodland, wetland, etc.)?</p> <p><i>Substantial portions of the project area contain major riparian and sensitive habitat areas (Significant Woodlands and Savannas). Future development of fences and walls in these areas may be subject to review by the ERB and the County's oak tree ordinance.</i></p>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)?</p> <p><i>The project area contains Coast Live Oak, Scrub Oak, and California Walnut trees. Future development of fences and walls potentially impacting oak trees will be subject to the requirements of the County's oak tree ordinance, which is not affected by these amendments. Developments requiring oak tree permits or potentially impacting unique native trees may be subject to review by the ERB.</i></p>
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)?</p> <p><i>Very limited portions of the project area contain Steelhead Trout and Southwestern Pond Turtle habitat areas. Future development of fences and walls in these areas may be subject to review by the ERB.</i></p>
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)?</p> <p><i>The project area includes several canyons and creeks, such as Topanga Creek, and publicly-owned open space which serve as wildlife corridors. Future development of fences and walls in required yards on private property will not obstruct, block, or narrow known wildlife corridors and open space linkages.</i></p>

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Lot Size ☒ Project Design

☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☒ ERB/SEATAC Review

☒ Oak Tree Permit

The proposed CSD amendments entail changes to procedure and modifications to development standards, and will not create new development. The project does not propose alteration of the County's existing oak tree ordinance, and future development of fences and walls requiring oak tree permits or potentially impacting unique native trees may be subject to review by the ERB.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, **biotic** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 4. Archaeological/Historical/Paleontological

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is the project site in or near an area containing known archaeological resources or containing features (drainage course, spring, knoll, rock outcroppings, or oak trees) that indicate potential archaeological sensitivity?</p> <p><i>The project area may include areas containing archaeological resources, and does contain oak trees and drainage courses – features indicating potential archaeological sensitivity. No development is proposed that could impact any archaeological resource areas. Future development of fences and walls may be subject to the County's oak tree ordinance, and will not block, obstruct, or impede drainage courses.</i></p>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?</p> <p><i>The project area may include areas containing rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources. No development is proposed that could impact any potential paleontological resources, and future development of fences and walls will not occur in areas containing rock formations, therefore no potential paleontological resources could be impacted.</i></p>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites?</p> <p><i>The project area may contain a small number of historic structures. No development is proposed, and future development will be subject to proposed development standards requiring fence and wall design be compatible with known historic structures.</i></p>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5?</p> <p><i>The project does not propose new development that could cause any substantial adverse changes in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource.</i></p>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</p> <p><i>The project does not propose new development that could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.</i></p>
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Other factors?</p> <p><i>N/A</i></p>

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Lot Size

☒ Project Design

☐ Phase 1 Archaeology Report

☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The proposed CSD amendments entail changes to procedure and modifications to development standards, and will not create new development. Future development of fences and walls will be subject to the County's oak tree ordinance, and requests for oak tree permits may be subject to review by the ERB.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **archaeological, historical, or paleontological** resources?

☐ Potentially significant

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 5. Mineral Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? <i>The project area does not contain Mineral Resource Zones as defined by the State of California.</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource discovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? <i>The project area does not contain Mineral Resource Zones as defined by the State of California.</i>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors? <i>N/A</i>

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☒ Project Design

The project area does not contain Mineral Resource Zones as defined by the State of California.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **mineral** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 6. Agriculture Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency to non-agricultural use? <i>No identified Farmland exists in the project area (Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Map).</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? <i>The project does not change zoning, and no Williamson Act contracts exist in the project area.</i>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment that due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? <i>No identified Farmland exists in the project area.</i>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors? <i>N/A</i>

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size

☐ Project Design

The project area does not contain identified Farmland.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **agriculture** resources?

☐ Potentially significant

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 7. Visual Qualities

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is the project site substantially visible from or will it obstruct views along a scenic highway (as shown on the Scenic Highway Element), or is it located within a scenic corridor or will it otherwise impact the viewshed?</p> <p><i>The project area does contain designated Scenic Elements, a Scenic Route, a Scenic Point, and existing and proposed Significant Ridgelines considered valuable visual resources in the Topanga Canyon area. However the proposed development standards include fence and wall height and transparency provisions (see below) to protect viewsheds and maximize visibility of the visual resources from roadways.</i></p>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?</p> <p><i>The project does not propose any new development. The proposed development standards include fence and wall height and transparency provisions to maximize views of the surrounding Topanga Canyon area from regional riding and hiking trails.</i></p>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area that contains unique aesthetic features?</p> <p><i>The project area is primarily a developed area.</i></p>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features?</p> <p><i>The project entails changes to procedure and modifications to development standards, and does not propose any new development or use. The proposed development standards contain provisions to regulate fence and wall height and materials for compatibility with adjacent natural and residential areas.</i></p>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems?</p> <p><i>The project does not propose new development. The proposed development standards contain provisions to regulate fence and wall height and transparency to reduce sun shadow, light or glare problems.</i></p>
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Other factors (e.g., grading or landform alteration)?</p> <p><i>N/A</i></p>

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size
 ☒ Project Design
 ☐ Visual Report
 ☐ Compatible Use

The proposed CSD amendments entail changes to procedure and modifications to development standards, and will not create new development. The proposed development standards for future fences and walls will address any potential impacts to visual quality, visual resources, and sun shadow, light or glare problems in the project area. Fences and walls in required yard setbacks exceeding 42 inches in height will be limited to six feet in height, and will be subject to minimum transparency levels.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **scenic** qualities?

☐ Potentially significant
 ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation
 ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 1. Traffic/Access

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project contain 25 dwelling units or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (roadway or intersections)? <i>The project area does have known congestion problems but the project does not propose any new development that would increase congestion problems.</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions? <i>The project does not propose new development. The proposed development standards include provisions for fence and wall height and transparency to enhance line-of-sight visibility.</i>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions? <i>The project will not affect parking capacity; no development is proposed.</i>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area? <i>The proposed amendments do not authorize the narrowing, blocking, or impeding of public rights-of-way in the Topanga Canyon area.</i>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the congestion management program (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds of 50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link be exceeded? <i>The project does not propose new development, therefore no traffic thresholds will be exceeded.</i>
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or program supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus, turnouts, bicycle racks)? <i>The proposed amendments do not authorize the narrowing, blocking, or impeding of public rights-of-way in the Topanga Canyon area, nor will these amendments prevent bus lanes/stops, turnouts, or bicycles racks from being used or implemented.</i>
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors? <i>N/A</i>

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☒ Project Design ☐ Traffic Report ☐ Consultation with Traffic & Lighting Division

The proposed CSD amendments entail changes to procedure and modifications to development standards, and will not create new development that would increase traffic congestion in the project area. The proposed development standards contain provisions that would enhance line-of-sight visibility for emergency responders and residents/employees in the area. These amendments do not propose any changes that would restrict or prevent access to or along public rights-of-way, nor will they conflict with any policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **traffic/access** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 2. Sewage Disposal

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant? <u>Parcels in the project area use onsite wastewater treatment systems (OWTS).</u>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site? <u>Parcels in the project area use OWTS.</u>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors? <u>N/A</u>

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste – Ordinance No. 6130

☒ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The proposed CSD amendments entail changes to procedure and modifications to development standards, and will not create new development.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **sewage disposal** facilities?

☐ Potentially significant

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 3. Education

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create capacity problems at the district level? <i>The project does not propose new development and will not increase student population in the project area.</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools that will serve the project site? <i>The project does not propose new development and will not increase student population in the project area.</i>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create student transportation problems? <i>The project does not propose new development and will not increase student population in the project area that could impact student transportation.</i>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand? <i>The project does not propose new development and will not increase student population or demand for library services in the project area.</i>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors? <i>N/A</i>

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Site Dedication
 ☒ Government Code Section 65995
 ☐ Library Facilities Mitigation Fee

The proposed CSD amendments entail changes to procedure and modifications to development standards, and will not create new development that could increase student population in the project area and impact school capacity, student transportation, or increase demand for library services.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **educational** facilities/services?

☐ Potentially significant
 ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation
 ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 4. Fire/Sheriff Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site?</p> <p><i>The project does not propose new development and will not increase the population of the project area, therefore this project will not increase demand for fire and sheriff services. In addition, the proposed development standards contain fence and wall height and transparency provisions to enhance line-of-sight visibility for emergency responders.</i></p>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area?</p> <p><i>The project does not propose new development and will not increase the population of the project area to increase demand on fire and sheriff services.</i></p>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Other factors?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">N/A</p>

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Fire Mitigation Fee

The proposed CSD amendments entail changes to procedure and modifications to development standards, and will not create new development that would increase demand for fire and sheriff services. The proposed development standards contain fence and wall maximum height and minimum transparency provisions to enhance line-of-sight visibility for emergency responders.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **fire/sheriff** services?

☐ Potentially significant

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 5. Utilities/Other Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate public water supply to meet domestic needs or to have an inadequate ground water supply and proposes water wells? <i>The project area does not have inadequate water supply, but no development is proposed that could increase population and demand for public water supply or require the use of water wells.</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs? <i>The project area may have inadequate water and pressure to meet fire fighting needs, but no development is proposed that could increase population and demand for water supply and pressure for fire fighting needs, or compromise current service levels.</i>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane? <i>The project does not propose new development that could increase population and demand for utility services, or compromise current service levels.</i>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)? <i>The project area has a sanitary waste disposal problem due to failing septic tank systems, but the project does not propose new development that could increase population and demand for additional systems. The County does have landfills reaching capacity, but no population increases are proposed that would further burden existing landfills.</i>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services or facilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, roads)? <i>The project does not propose new development that could increase population and demand for new or physically-altered government facilities.</i>
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors? <i>N/A</i>

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269

☒ Water Code – Ordinance No. 7834

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size

☒ Project Design

The proposed CSD amendments entail changes to procedure and modifications to development standards, and will not create new development that could increase population and demand for utilities or other services.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **utilities** services?

☐ Potentially significant

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 1. General

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in an inefficient use of energy resources? <i>The project does not propose new development that could result in the inefficient use of energy resources.</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community? <i>The project does not propose new development and does not propose changes to land use policy maps. The proposed amendments include provisions regulating fence and wall height and materials for compatibility with the Topanga Canyon area scale and character.</i>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land? <i>The project does not propose changes to land use categories or zoning, therefore no reduction in the amount of agricultural land will occur.</i>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors? <i>N/A</i>

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ State Administrative Code, Title 24, Part 5, T-20 (Energy Conservation)

☐ MITIGATION MEASURE

☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☒ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

The proposed CSD amendments entail changes to procedure and modifications to development standards, and will not create new development or make changes to land use policy maps. The proposed amendments include provisions regulating fence and wall height and materials for compatibility with the Topanga Canyon area scale and character.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to any of the above factors?

☐ Potentially significant

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 2. Environmental Safety

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site? <i>Portions of the project area contain developments that utilize propane tanks, however no new development is proposed that could increase the use or storage of propane tanks or any hazardous materials within the project area.</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site? <i>Portions of the project area contain developments that utilize propane tanks, however no new development is proposed that could increase the use or storage of propane tanks or any hazardous materials within the project area.</i>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected? <i>The project proposes only changes to procedure and modifications to development standards. No new development is proposed.</i>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Have there been previous uses that indicate residual soil toxicity of the site or is the site located within two miles downstream of a known groundwater contamination source within the same watershed? <i>The project area may contain previous uses that indicate residual soil toxicity or are located within two miles downstream of a known groundwater contamination source within the same watershed, but the proposed amendments do not authorize expansion of these uses or new uses that could contaminate water sources.</i>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment? <i>The project does not propose development that could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the potential accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment.</i>
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? <i>The project does not propose development that could emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.</i>
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or environment? <i>The project area does not contain any hazardous materials sites as referenced in the State of California Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor database.</i>
h.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in a safety hazard for people in a project area located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip? <i>The project is not located within an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip.</i>
i.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? <i>The project does not propose new development that could interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The amendments do not authorize the narrowing, blocking, or impeding of public rights-of-way that could restrict access to emergency services.</i>
j.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors? <i>N/A</i>

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Toxic Clean-up Plan

☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The proposed CSD amendments entail changes to procedure and modifications to development standards, and will not create new development or authorize changes to land use policy maps, and will not result in the narrowing, blocking, or impeding access of emergency services.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact relative to **public safety**?

☐ Potentially significant

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 3. Land Use

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property? <i>The project entails changes to procedure and modifications to development standards, and does not propose changes to land use or zoning in the project area.</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property? <i>The project entails changes to procedure and modifications to development standards, and does not propose changes to land use or zoning in the project area.</i>
c.				Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable land use criteria:
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hillside Management Criteria?
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SEA Conformance Criteria?
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other?
				<i>N/A</i>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project physically divide an established community? <i>The project entails changes to procedure and modifications to development standards, and does not propose any development that could physically divide an established community.</i>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?
				<i>N/A</i>

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The proposed CSD amendments entail changes to procedure and modifications to development standards, and will not create new development or make changes to land use policy maps.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **land use** factors?

☐ Potentially significant

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 4. Population/Housing/Employment/Recreation

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?</p> <p><i>The project entails changes to procedure and modifications to development standards, and does not propose changes to land use or zoning that could increase density or impact regional or local population projections.</i></p>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Could the project induce substantial direct or indirect growth in an area (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?</p> <p><i>The project area is already developed. No development is being proposed that could induce substantial direct or indirect growth in the area.</i></p>
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?</p> <p><i>The project entails changes to procedure and modifications to development standards. No development is being proposed that could displace existing housing, especially affordable housing.</i></p>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Could the project result in substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)?</p> <p><i>The project does not propose changes to the mix of housing and commercial uses. No development is being proposed that could result in a substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in VMT.</i></p>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents?</p> <p><i>The project entails changes to procedure and modifications to development standards. No development is being proposed that could require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents.</i></p>
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</p> <p><i>The project entails changes to procedure and modifications to development standards. The project does not propose new development or redevelopment activities that could displace people.</i></p>
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Other factors?</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>N/A</i></p>

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The proposed CSD amendments entail changes to procedure and modifications to development standards, and will not create new development or authorize changes to land use policy maps that could result in population increases.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **population, housing, employment, or recreational** factors?

☐ Potentially significant

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than significant/No impact

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on this Initial Study, the following findings are made:

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project have possible environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the environment?

☐ Potentially significant

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than significant/No impact